UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,665	04/06/2001	Timothy J. Messler	2258.001	6739

7590   03/26/2003

Michael A. Slavin
McHale & Slavin, P.A.
4440 PGA Blvd., Suite 402
Palm Beach Gardens, FL   33410

EXAMINER
ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *2* .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1, 10-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Van Huben et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,878,408) in view of Bhaskaran et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,157,915).

As to claim 1, Van Huben et al. discloses a method of engineering project design (See

column 4, lines 6-29) using a real-time interface (See column 4, lines 56-61) with a global

computer network (See column 10, lines 1-16, wherein "global" reads on "anywhere in the

world"), said method comprising:

indexing said database according to predetermined engineering search queries (See

column 15, lines 14-67); providing a graphical user interface (GUI) allowing a user to (See

column 23, lines 37-44):

(i) perform a categorized database inquiry for an engineering project (See column 15,

lines 14-67, wherein "categorized database" reads on "library") by using a cascading drop-down

menu process (See column 26, lines 45-63);

(ii) input critical parameters regarding the specification and requirements for the engineering project (See column 23, lines 13-27, also see column 15, lines 3-12, wherein "critical parameters" reads on "entire set design components"); and

(iii) compile project information into a job folder checklist (See column 6, lines 32-51, wherein "job folder checklist" reads on "BOM"); and inserting the information into the job folder checklist (See column 6, lines 32-51, wherein "job folder checklist" reads on "BOM", also see column 33, lines 1-11).

Van Huben et al. does not disclose creating a database for approved engineering specific Universal Record Locator (URL) link; retrieval of URL links according to the database inquiry; accessing Web pages related to the retrieved URL links; and displaying pertinent information of the accessed Web pages.

Bhaskaran et al. discloses creating a database (See column 5, lines 1-9, also see column 6, lines 40-45) for approved engineering specific Universal Record Locator (URL) link (See column 7, lines 17-39, wherein "approved engineering" reads on "appropriate work order"); retrieval of URL links according to the database inquiry (See column 7, lines 28-38); accessing Web pages related to the retrieved URL links (See column 8, lines 15-29, wherein "Web pages" reads on "respective URL's of vendors and assemblers"); and displaying pertinent information of the accessed Web pages (See column 4, lines 64-67, and column 5, lines 1-12, wherein "pertinent information" reads on "process information necessary for decision making", and wherein "Web Pages" reads on "documents").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Van Huben et al. to include creating a database for

approved engineering specific Universal Record Locator (URL) link; retrieval of URL links according to the database inquiry; accessing Web pages related to the retrieved URL links; and displaying pertinent information of the accessed Web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Van Huben et al. by the teaching of Bhaskaran et al. to include creating a database for approved engineering specific Universal Record Locator (URL) link; retrieval of URL links according to the database inquiry; accessing Web pages related to the retrieved URL links; and displaying pertinent information of the accessed Web pages because in today's global economy the world wide web through web pages and URL provides accessibility across the global business providing for collaborations and reduction of business costs (See Bhaskaran et al. column 1, lines 40-44).

As to claim 10, Van Huben et al. as modified discloses including the step of displaying and printing of a flow diagram detailing the engineering project (See Bhaskaran et al. column 7, lines 1-7, wherein "flow diagram" reads on "work flow items").

As to claim 11, Van Huben et al. as modified discloses further including the step of displaying and printing of selected components (See column 25, lines 9-20) selected during the Web page review (See Bhaskaran et al. column 5, lines 1-24, wherein "Web page review" reads on "limits access...role players", also see Van Huben et al. column 27, lines 52-67).

As to claim 12, <u>Van Huben et al</u>. as modified discloses further including the step of retrieving regulatory data from a Web page review (See <u>Bhaskaran et al.</u> column, also see <u>Van Huben et al.</u> column 27, lines 52-67, also see <u>Bhaskaran et al.</u> column 5, lines 25-64, wherein "regulatory data" reads on "industry standards").

As to claim 14, <u>Van Huben et al</u>. as modified discloses further the step of printing a report (See column 25, lines 9-20, also see column 27, lines 52-67) on the engineering project based on information in the job folder checklist (See column 6, lines 32-51, wherein "job folder checklist" reads on "BOM", also see column 33, lines 1-11, also see <u>Bhaskaran et al.</u> column 7, lines 52-67, and column 8, lines 1-4, wherein "checklist" reads on "approve plan").

3. Claims 2-9, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Van Huben et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,878,408) and <u>Bhaskaran et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,915) as applied to claims 1, 10-12, and 14 above, and further in view of <u>Bentley et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,063,128).

As to claim 2, <u>Van Huben et al.</u> as modified does not disclose further including:

displaying of a plurality of engineering disciplines;

listing of conventional engineering projects within each engineering discipline; and

providing a design process template for each engineering discipline integrated into the GUI.

<u>Bentley et al.</u> discloses further including:

displaying of a plurality of engineering disciplines (See column 2, lines 60-67);

listing of conventional engineering projects within each engineering discipline (See column 1, lines 43-60); and

providing a design process template for each engineering discipline (See column 2, lines 60-67) integrated into the GUI (See column 11, lines 1-29, also see column 3, lines 52-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Van Huben et al. as modified to include listing of conventional engineering projects within each engineering discipline; and providing a design process template for each engineering discipline integrated into the GUI.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified Van Huben et al. as modified by the teaching of Bentley et al. to include listing of conventional engineering projects within each engineering discipline; and providing a design process template for each engineering discipline integrated into the GUI because creating an engineering specific GUI provides for flexibility and extensibility and ease of use.

As to claim 3, Van Huben et al. as modified discloses wherein the design process template prompts a user to input the critical parameters for a selected engineering project (See column 23, lines 13-27, also see column 15, lines 3-12, wherein "critical parameters" reads on "entire set design components").

As to claim 4, <u>Van Huben et al</u>. as modified discloses wherein the design process template includes formulas for a selected engineering project (See column 50, lines 17-67, wherein "formulas" reads on "pseudo process calculates piece of data").

As to claim 5, <u>Van Huben et al</u>. as modified discloses wherein the design process template includes a drop-down menu for a selected engineering project (See column 26, lines 45-63).

As to claim 6, <u>Van Huben et al</u>. as modified discloses further including the steps of: performing iterative calculations to arrive at an acceptable final design (See column 18, lines 57-67, and column 19, lines 1-20, wherein "iterative" reads on "new iteration", and wherein "calculations" reads on "pseudo-process", and wherein "acceptable" reads on "goodness"); and inserting the design data into the job folder checklist (See column 6, lines 32-51, wherein "job folder checklist" reads on "BOM", also see column 33, lines 1-11, also see <u>Bhaskaran et al</u>. column 7, lines 52-67, and column 8, lines 1-4, wherein "checklist" reads on "approve plan").

As to claim 7, <u>Van Huben et al</u>. as modified discloses wherein the iterative calculations (See column 18, lines 57-67, and column 19, lines 1-20, wherein "iterative" reads on "new iteration", and wherein "calculations" reads on "pseudo-process") are based on material specifications acquired from a Web page review (See <u>Bhaskaran et al</u>. column 5, lines 1-24, wherein "Web page review" reads on "limits access...role players", also see <u>Van Huben et al</u>. column 27, lines 52-67, wherein "material specifications" reads on "BOM").

As to claim 8, <u>Van Huben et al</u>. as modified discloses wherein the iterative calculations (See column 18, lines 57-67, and column 19, lines 1-20, wherein "iterative" reads on "new iteration", and wherein "calculations" reads on "pseudo-process") are based on component specifications (See column 25, lines 9-20) acquired from a Web page review (See <u>Bhaskaran et al</u>. column 5, lines 1-24, wherein "Web page review" reads on "limits access...role players", also see <u>Van Huben et al</u>. column 27, lines 52-67).

As to claim 9, <u>Van Huben et al</u>. as modified discloses wherein the iterative calculations are based on design tables (See column 18, lines 57-67, and column 19, lines 1-20, wherein "iterative" reads on "new iteration", and wherein "calculations" reads on "pseudo-process", and wherein "table" reads on "level") acquired from a Web page review (See <u>Bhaskaran et al</u>. column 5, lines 1-24, wherein "Web page review" reads on "limits access...role players", also see <u>Van Huben et al</u>. column 27, lines 52-67).

As to claim 13, <u>Van Huben et al</u>. as modified discloses further including a step of selection regulatory data to conform to a specific geographical location.

<u>Van Huben et al</u>. as modified does not disclose further including a step of selection regulatory data to conform to a specific geographical location.

<u>Bhaskaran et al</u>. discloses further including a step of selection regulatory data to conform to a specific geographical location (See figure 4, shows "specific geographical location" represented by "Part number" heading which indicates that the party can be displayed under

"geography" as a choice from the drop-down menu", also see column 5, lines 25-64, wherein "regulatory data" reads on "industry standards").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified <u>Van Huben et al</u>. to include further including a step of selection regulatory data to conform to a specific geographical location.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified <u>Van Huben et al</u>. by the teaching of <u>Bhaskaran et al.</u> to include further including a step of selection regulatory data to conform to a specific geographical location because providing accurate and timely workflow information creates business costs savings and reduces processing time.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

<u>Mora et al.</u> (U.S Patent No. 6,161,113) discloses computer-aided project notebook.

<u>Swartz et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,994) discloses integration of information and knowledge.

<u>Gunderwar et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,610) discloses implementing project procedures.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 703-305-8114. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4: 30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Neveen Abel-Jalil
March 11, 2003

DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100